UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/518,015	03/03/2000	Elliot A. Gottfurcht	004346.P001X	5511

7590   02/27/2003

Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
Seventh floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER
JOSEPH, THOMAS J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 09/518,015	**Applicant(s)** GOTTFURCHT ET AL.
		Examiner Thomas J Joseph	**Art Unit** 2174

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 December 2002* .

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) *11-22* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *27 December 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1, 2, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Dolan et al (US 5,801,702) and Arora et al (US 5,911,145).

Claims 1 and 6:

Dolan teaches a software program (abstract). All software programs require a

computer readable storage medium containing executable computer program

instructions. Such computer instructions operate on a digital processor. Dolan teaches

providing links for accessing a sister site that permits simplified navigation (fig. 8c; col.

18, lines 18 – 35). Any page accessible throughout the tree of the hierarchy is a sister

page. Dolan teaches serving pages from the sister site responsive to actuation of the

link on the web page (fig. 8c; col. 18, lines 18 – 35). When any sister page is selected,

web pages are opened. These web pages are serving pages responsive to the

actuation of the link. Dolan fail to teach a specific web page for providing links to sister

sites or any other site. Dolan does suggest the need for providing a specific link to a

sister site by providing a list of potential sites. Further, pages higher up in the hierarchy

do suggest the potential of storing multiple pages within a site.

Arora teaches a web site containing links to various sister sites along with potential outside sites (fig. 4, #470, #472). Arora teaches providing a link to a sister site (fig. 43; col. 14, lines 35 – 40). Arora mentions linking to a next sibling or a previous linking. This demonstrates accessing various sister sites. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine web site containing links taught by Arora with the sister sites responsive to the actuation of links disclosed by Dolan. Doing so allows the user including the user not familiar with computer terminology to navigate to different links within the web site in a timesaving fashion.

Claims 2 and 7:

Dolan fails to teach a method for entering alphanumeric indications associated with the navigation option. Arora teaches a method where a user can enter alphanumeric indications, in the form of a character string, associated with a URL (fig. 43). The URL is a type of navigation option. The naming of a node using the properties of a window is a method wherein the processor accepts an alphanumeric indication of a navigation option. Arora teaches a matrix that corresponds with a navigation option (fig. 40; col. 14, lines 5 – 23). The various cells within the matrix are used for displaying a portion of the corresponding web page. Links to accessing a full screen version of the said web page can be provided. This is a method where a matrix is equipped with a navigation option. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine entering alphanumeric indicators taught by Arora with the sister sites responsive to the actuation of links Dolan. Doing so allows the user

including the user not familiar with computer terminology to personally customize names

for potential links.

3.   Claims 3 – 5 and 8 – 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Dolan and Arora as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in

view of Charles Heinemann, "Going from HTML to XML", Microsoft Corporation and Call

(US 6,418,441).

Claims 3 and 8:

Dolan and Arora fail to disclose transcoding, formatting, or cascading XML, DTD,

HTML, etc. Heinemann teaches converting HTML pages to XML (p. 2). It would have

been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine

the processing and transcoding of markup language suggested or taught by Heinemann

with the method for making sister sites responsive to the actuation of links disclosed by

Dolan and Arora. Doing so allows the user to transcode various markup languages

including HTML into a universal form that is more universal such as XML.

Dolan, Arora, and Heineman fail to teach applying a DTD to XML.   Call teaches

applying a DTD to XML (col. 25; lines 10 – 20). Call further teaches that XML provides

metadata capabilities that divide information into a hierarchical structure (col. 25, lines

10 – 20). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to combine the applying a DTD to XML taught by Call with the method for

making sister sites responsive to the actuation of links disclosed by Dolan, Arora, and

Heineman. Doing so provides a standard method for facilitating the definition and

validation of data structures.

Claims 4 and 9:

Call teaches formatting the XML into XSL (col. 24; lines 10 – 30). Call teaches

transforming the formatted page into one of extensible HTML and HTML (col. 24; lines

10 – 30).

Claims 5 and 10:

Call teaches applying a cascading style sheet (CSS) to the XML page (col. 24;

lines 10 – 30).

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments filed 1-16-2002 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

The Examiner objected to the drawings in the previous office action. The

Applicant responds by providing a new set of formal drawings that overcomes the said

objection. The Examiner therefore withdraws the said objection.

The Applicant acknowledges the restriction of the previous office action by

stating that claims 1 – 10 are elected without traverse.

The Applicant responds to the 35 USC 103 rejections of claims 1, 2, 6, and 7.

The Applicant asserts that Dolan does not teach a web page that provides links to a

sister site. The Examiner responds by stating that pages within the hierarchy,

particularly those that access a set of sub-pages, demonstrate a web site. The website

editor demonstrated by Arora teaches the concepts for providing a sibling URL. A URL

teaches accessing a link to a different web site or web page within a said website while

a link to a sibling URL teaches accessing a sister web site. The Applicant asserts that

motivation does not exist for combining Dolan and Arora because the first is a network client while the second is a web page editor. The Examiner responds by stating that both Dolan and Arora provide motivation because both teach the basic concepts for constructing pages for use on with the World Wide Web.

In regards to claims 2 and 7, the Applicant asserts that Arora fails to teach accepting alphanumeric input corresponding with a navigation option. The Applicant also asserts that Arora fails to teach the navigation option associated with the matrix disclosed by the Applicant. The Examiner responds by stating that Arora teaches a method where a user can enter alphanumeric indications, in the form of a character string, associated with a URL (fig. 43). The URL is a type of navigation option. The naming of a node using the properties of a window is a method wherein the processor accepts an alphanumeric indication of a navigation option. Arora teaches a matrix that corresponds with a navigation option (fig. 40; col. 14, lines 5 – 23). The various cells within the matrix are used for displaying a portion of the corresponding web page. Providing links or buttons for accessing full screen versions of the said web pages displayed on the matrix is a method for navigation. This is how a matrix can be equipped with a navigation option.

Due to at least the above reasons, the 35 USC 103 rejections of claims 1 – 2, 6, and 7 remains standing.

The Applicant responds to the rejection of claims 3 – 5 and 8 – 10. However. The response is now moot due to new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Thomas J Joseph whose telephone number is 703-305-

3917. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 am - 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone numbers

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239

for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-

3900.

tjj
February 21, 2003

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100